

Michigan Department of Agriculture

Food Service Program Cycle 4, Option 2 Assessment Forms

Food & Dairy Division
Michigan Department of Agriculture
PO Box 30017
Lansing, MI 48909
Ph: (517) 373-1060

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: Review Period: Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

Executive Summary

MPR	Sta	atus	Findings
	M/MC	NM/NA	i mango
Plan Rev		14101/14/	
1	<u> </u>		
Evaluatio	ns		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
0			
8 Records			
9	1		
Enforcen	nont		
10	Tent		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
	inina & Q	ualificatio	ons
16			
17			
18			
Foodborr	ne Illness	Investiga	ations
19			
20			
Importan			d To Determine Accreditation Status
	M	NA	
Industry	and Com	munity Re	elations
IF 1			
	ng Educa	tion for R	egulatory Staff
IF 2			
Program	Support		
IF 3			
Quality A	ssurance	Program	J
IF 4			

M= Met

MC= Met with Conditions

NM= Not Met NA= Not Applicable NOTE: Remember that CPA's must be written in the six element format described in Annex 1.

Food Service Assessment Forms
Review Dates: Review Period: Agency:
Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

MPR Summary

MPR 1	Plan Review Summary	
	Compliance from health department self-assessment	
	Number of plan files reviews by auditor	
	Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
	Additor agreement with sen-assessment.	
	Compliance with MPR 1	
MDD 0	Due On anima Freeheation e	
MPR 2	Pre-Opening Evaluations Compliance from health department self-assessment	
	Number of plan files reviews by auditor	
	Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
	Additor agreement with sen-assessment.	
	Compliance with MPR 2	
	·	
MPR 3	Evaluation Frequency	
	Compliance from health department self-assessment	
	Number of files reviews by auditor	
	Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
	Compliance with MPR 3	
	ERBIS in place for this time period: to	
MPR 4	Vending Evaluation Frequency	
WII IX 7	Compliance from health department self-assessment	
	Number of vending files reviews by auditor	
	Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
	Compliance with MPR 4	
MDD E	Tomporory Food Sorving	
IVIPK 3	Temporary Food Service	
	Compliance from health department self-assessment	
	Number of temporary licenses and evaluations reviewed by auditor	
	Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
	Compliance with MPR 5	
MPR 6	Evaluation Procedures	
	Compliance from health department self-assessment	
	Number of files reviews by auditor	
	Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
	Compliance with MPR 6	

MPR 7 and 8 FIELD-Inspector's written documents were reviewed per Important Factor 4 Number of evaluators reviewed by auditor Number of facilities visited Auditor agreement using the Field Evaluation Worksheet (FEW) Frequency of QA is completed according to IF 4 or FDA retail Standard 2 Compliance with MPR 7 and 8 **MPR 9 Records** Compliance from health department self-assessment Auditor agreement with self-assessment: Compliance with MPR 9 MPR 10 Written Enforcement Policy, Proper Use Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of enforcement actions reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment: Compliance with MPR 10 MPR 11 Unauthorized Construction - Stop Work Order Usage Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of plans reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment: Compliance with MPR 11 MPR 12 Follow-Up Evaluation Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of files reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment: **Compliance with MPR 12 MPR 13 License Limitations** Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of limited licenses reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment:

Reviewer(s):

Initial Visit / Revisit

Compliance with MPR 13

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Period:

Review Dates:

Food Service Assessment Forms Review Dates: Review Period: Agency: Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit	
MPR 14 Variances Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of variances reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
Compliance with MPR 14	
MPR 15 Complaint Investigation Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of complaints reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
Compliance with MPR 15	
MPR 16 New Staff- Academic Training in 6 Areas Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of training files reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
Compliance with MPR 16	
MPR 17 New Staff- Evaluations with Standardized Trainer Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of training files reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
Compliance with MPR 17	
MPR 18 Other Staff- Training for Mobile, STFU, Vending and TFE Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of training files reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
Compliance with MPR 18	
MPR 19 Foodborne Illness Investigations Conducted Compliance from health department self-assessment Number of FBI investigation files reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment:	
Compliance with MPR 19	
MPR 20 Foodborne Illness Procedures Compliance from health department self-assessment	

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency: Review Dates: Review Period: Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit		
Number of FBI investigation files reviewed by auditor Auditor agreement with self-assessment:		
Compliance with MPR 20		
mportant Factor I- Industry and Community Relations	MET	NA
Department not attempting to meet this IF		
mportant Factor II - Continuing Education of Regulatory Staff Department not attempting to meet this IF	MET	NA
mportant Factor III- Program Support Department not attempting to meet this IF # licensed establishments/150 = A recommended numl /225 = B minimum number F7	MET Der FTE's TE's	NA s
# temporary licenses issued/300 = C FTE's needed for ten	nporary e	evaluation
D. Total Minimum FTE's (B+C)= E. Total Recommended FTE's	(A+C)=	
F. Actual FTE's assigned to FS program		
Met if: F≥E		
mportant Factor IV- Quality Assurance Program Department not attempting to meet this IF	MET	NA
Written quality assurance program developed		
At least 10 inspection reports for each sanitarian's food insp. or FBI records l Quality assurance review conducted every 24 months	nave bee	en reviewed.
Every employee assigned to program has completed 2 joint inspections with	trainer e	very 24 months

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: Review Period: Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

ACCREDITATION, OPTION 2 FIELD EVALUATION WORKSHEET (Performance Elements and Competencies)

Establishment Name:	Establishment Addı	ress:
Auditor's Name:	Auditor's Agency	
Inspector's Name:	Inspector's Agency	:
Date of Audit:	Time IN:	Time OUT:

Inspections Observations and Performance

		Opportunity to Demonstrate Competency	Competency Demonstrated		
		NO	YES	NO	
	C) Risk Based Inspection / Active Managerial Control				
1	Verified demonstration of knowledge of the person in charge.				
2	Verified the restriction or exclusion of ill employees.				
3	Verified the availability of a consumer advisory for foods of animal origin served raw or undercooked.				
4	Verified approved food sources (e.g., food from regulated food processing plants; shellfish documentation; wild game & mushrooms, game animal processing; parasite destruction for certain species of fish intended for raw consumption; receiving temperatures).				
5	Verified cooking temperatures to destroy bacteria and parasites.				
6	Verified reheating temperatures of TCS food for hot holding.				
7	Verified cooling temperatures of TCS food to prevent the outgrowth of spore-forming or toxin-forming bacteria.				
8	Verified cold holding temperatures of foods requiring time/temperature control for safety (TCS food), or when necessary, verified that procedures are in place to use time alone to control bacterial growth and toxin production.				
9	Verified hot holding temperatures of TCS food or when necessary, that procedures were in place to use time alone to prevent the outgrowth of sporeforming bacteria.				
10	Verified date marking of ready-to-eat foods TCS food held for more than 24 hours.				
11	Verified food safety practices for preventing cross- contamination of ready-to-eat food.				
12	Verified food contact surfaces are clean and sanitized, protected from contamination from soiled cutting boards, utensils, aprons, etc., or raw animal foods.				
13	Verified employee hand washing (including facility availability)				

Food Service Assessment Forms
Review Dates: Review Period: Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

14	Verified good hygienic practices (eat, drinking, and sneezing, coughing or runny nowork with food/utensils)	ose no				
15	Verified no bare hand contact with ready-to- foods (or use of a pre-approved, alternative procedure).					
16	Verified proper use, storage and labeling of chemicals; sulfites					
17	Identified food processes and/or procedures require an HACCP Plan per the jurisdiction' regulations.					
Con	nments:					
	E) Good Retail Practices					
1	Correctly assesses compliance status of oth regulations (not included in Item 3 – Good F Practices) that are included in jurisdiction's statutes, regulations and/or ordinances.	Retail				
	Comments:					
		Total nui of opportur	Number of opportunities to demonstrate	comp	mber of petencies ponstrated	Individual Score
Risk based / Active Managerial Control and Good Retail Practices		18				

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: Review Period: Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

Option 2 – Field Exercise Summary (MPR 7 & 8)

Category	Individual Evaluator's %						Final %
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Risk Based Inspection and Good Retail Practices							

Data is obtained from each evaluator's Field Evaluation Worksheet

See guidance Document, Annex 11 to determine the number of inspectors evaluated during the review.

Each inspector will be evaluated using this form. The inspector's individual scores will be averaged to establish the department percentage for determination of Met / Met with Conditions / Not Met.

Met: 70 - 100% department compliance with risk based evaluation methodology.

Met with Conditions: 60-69% department compliance with risk based evaluation methodology.

Not Met: Less than 60% department compliance with risk based evaluation methodology

Example:			Example:		
Inspector 1	65%		Inspector 1	65%	
Inspector 2	94%		Inspector 2	50%	
Average:	79%	Met	Inspector 3	55%	
-			Inspector 4	87%	
			Average:	64%	Met with Conditions

The Field Exercise is Met: _____, Met with Conditions _____, Not Met: _____